S.B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.1372/2005
Gagandeep Sethi
VS
University of Bikaner & Anr.

DATE OF ORDER 14.3.2005

HON'BLE MR. PRAKASH TATIA, J.

Mr. G.R.Goyal, for the petitioner.

<><><>

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Though the result of First Year TDC Arts was declared by the University, but the petitioner's result was withheld. According to petitioner, the petitioner submitted application for declaration of his result before the Registrar, University on 5th Dec., 2004 and petitioner also submitted his bonafide resident certificate as demanded by the University earlier, still the petitioner's result was not declared. According to petitioner on demand, he also deposited late fees amounting to Rs.40/- on 21.2.2005 with the respondent no.1. According petitioner, no receipt of said Rs.40/- was given to the petitioner. According to petitioner, the respondent no.1 orally told the petitioner that his result will be declared soon and also informed that he passed the First Year TDC Arts Examination, but in one paper he got supplementary. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner offered his examination form for the Second Year TDC Arts as

non-collegiate students alongwith prescribed fees, but the respondent no.2 College refused to accept the form, thereupon, the petitioner sent the form alongwith fees by registered post.

In the backdrop of these facts, the petitioner is now seeking relief for declaration of the result of the petitioner for the course of First Year TDC Arts and also seeking direction against the respondents to permit the petitioner to take examination of the Second Year.

It is clear from the facts mentioned above itself that the result of First Year TDC Arts was declared long ago, but the result of the petitioner was left and petitioner did not challenge the action of the respondents till the examinations for Second Year TDC Arts are about to start in two or three days only.

In view of the above reasons only, the writ petition of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed on the ground of inordinate delay and laches on the part of the petitioner.

Hence, the writ petition of the petitioner is dismissed.

(PRAKASH TATIA), J.

c.p.goyal/-